

motions for summary judgment, provides otherwise or says anything about 30 pages. And Defendant in fact did limit its response to 25 pages, and it is readily apparent that it was very intentional and scrupulous in sticking to the 25-page limit. Therefore, Defendant neither was actually allowed, nor arrogated to itself, up to 30 pages. Third, and most importantly, the motion fails to provide a single explanation as to why Plaintiff needs additional pages beyond those allotted to her in the local rules or actually used by Defendant. Plaintiff merely provides the Court with a summary of what is contained in her brief, but this is not sufficient to support a request for pages beyond the allotted norm.

The Court does not wish to be a stickler for issues in a manner that neither benefit the Court nor the parties, and it regularly provides such extensions as long as they are supported by a request that sets forth legitimate need and is not tarnished by incorrect statements or extreme sloppiness. The Court is responsible for supervising practice in this District, ensuring a certain level of compliance with the local rules, and not simply rubber-stamping inadequate requests for relief. After receiving an initial inadequate request from Plaintiff, Court permitted Plaintiff a second opportunity to obtain the relief it sought, but Plaintiff squandered the opportunity. The Court must insist that such an uncomplicated matter as a page-limit extension be handled better by parties and counsel than it was handled here.

For the reasons stated herein, Plaintiff's amended motion for leave to file additional pages is **DENIED**. By December 28, 2022, Plaintiff at her option may re-file her motion at Doc. No. 45 an edited version that complies with the applicable 25-page limitation prescribed by the local rules. If she chooses not to do so, the Court will review Plaintiff's filing at Doc. No. 46 but will consider only the first twenty-five pages.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



ELI RICHARDSON
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE